

REMARKS

This is a Supplemental Response to append the Amendment and Remarks filed on December 3, 2010.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,412,389 to Krüger (hereinafter “Krüger”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,684 to Wentzlaff (hereinafter “Wentzlaff”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,257,170 to Gestblom et al. (hereinafter “Gestblom”). *Office Action* at p. 3.

In the Advisory Action, the Office alleges that “Kruger, Wentzlaff and Gestblom meet the claimed invention because the argued three periods of drying time meet the detecting and substantial temperature increase is met by the prior art as rejected because it is inherent for a time period to have distinct temperature differences upon heating and/or airflow.” *Advisory Action* at p. 2. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The claimed invention requires, as recited in claim 1, “calculating a plurality of temperature variation rates” and “detecting whether there is a substantial increase in the temperature variation rate with respect to the temperature variation rate of the initiating the drying procedure.” The temperature variation rate differs from the temperature difference since the rate includes the time factor. Further, the claimed invention requires “detecting whether there is a substantial increase in the temperature variation rate with respect to the temperature variation rate of the initiating the drying procedure” and “calculating a remaining drying time after the substantial increased is detected,” as recited in claim 1. In other words, according to the claimed invention, the drying process will be performed after detecting that there is a substantial increase in the temperature variation rate with respect to the temperature variation rate of the initiating the drying procedure.

In contrast, Kruger discloses a means for supplying system-related data concerning the drying of particular laundry which comprises determining the gradient of rising temperature in the drying system during a given early phase of the drying process, calculating a required operating time or duration. Therefore, Kruger discloses only the drying procedure consisting of the given early phase of the drying process and the remaining drying process. Further, Kruger does not disclose or suggest detecting whether there is a substantial increase in the temperature

variation rate with respect to the temperature variation rate of initiating the drying procedure to calculate a remaining drying time.

Also, according to Wentzlaff, at the beginning of the drying process ($t=4$) the remaining drying time is calculated. Therefore, Wentzlaff discloses only the drying procedure consisting of the initial drying process and the remaining drying process. Further, Wentzlaff does not disclose or suggest detecting whether there is a substantial increase in the temperature variation rate with respect to the temperature variation rate of initiating the drying procedure to calculate a remaining drying time.

Moreover, according to Gestblom the drying process ends at t (time) = t_3 . However, t_3 is not constant and is not the time to be calculated. In other words, the drying process at T (temperature) = $T' + T_2$. Herein T_2 is a predetermined value. Therefore, Gestblom does not disclose or suggest that calculating a remaining drying time after the substantial increased is detected.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 and claims 16 and 18-21, which depend therefrom, are not *prima facie* obvious and are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 16 and 18-21.

CONCLUSION

The application is in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: January 3, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By Alyssa K. Sandrowitz/
Alyssa K. Sandrowitz
Registration No.: 65,401
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant